Standards Subcommittee Meeting
June 18, 2003
2pm – 4pm
Attorney General's Conference Room

Attendees

➢ Wilbur Rehmann – MCJISP DOJ	➢ Colleen Llewellyn – DPHHS/OTD
➢ Bruce Coensgen – MTDOJ ITSD	➢ Art Pembroke – L&C County
➢ Jim Dolezal – Missoula County	➢ Lynne Pizzini -- ITSD
➢ Jim Dougherty -- DOC	➢ Kim Randall – MTDOJ ITSD
➢ Larry Fasbender – MTDOJ	➢ Mike Raczkowski – DOC
➢ Carl Hotvedt - ITSD	➢ Janet Jessup – Northrop Grumman

Review of Standardized Data Elements List Compared to Local Systems
The Subcommittee began the meeting by looking at three handouts showing a comparison of the standardized data list with local systems. The handouts – for Billings PD, Missoula County, and L&C County – identified the elements that are not on the local systems but are on the standardized list.

Carl Hotvedt asked again if the purpose of the standardized list is to define data that can be shared across various systems; if so, some of the elements may not be of interest across different systems. Logically the next step is to decide which ones are mandatory. Bruce Coensgen said that many agencies will use elements that are not of interest to others and will develop style sheets for their own purposes; in fact, an argument could be made that nothing is required, but if an agency does anything, the data dictionary should be used.

Wilbur asked if anything should be changed in the standardized list based on the review of the local comparisons. There was agreement that the standardized list should not be changed because the elements are missing from the local systems, not vice versa. Most of the missing elements reflect elements in JCMS or items on the NTA, particularly traffic stops.

Review of Standardized Data Elements List to JXDD
The group then turned to the standardized list mapped to the JXDD. The question before the group was whether to formally adopt the JXDD as the comprehensive standard, as discussed at the last meeting, and what to do with the standardized list. Art Pembroke stated that the JXDD is really the transmission format, and he asked whether the standardized list should be recommended or required data, particularly for local systems. Jim Dolezal mentioned the development of a statewide court system, and he stated that both MANS and fingerprint data is currently being collected at the local level. Furthermore, the new live scan systems will be consistent throughout the state and will require the input of the same type of data. He asked if data is required for such basic documents such as the MANS sheet and fingerprint card, why can't the state say these are required? Discussion ensued about the function of the standardized list. Since the

elements are not all used by every agency but are commonly used by the larger criminal justice community, should the list be recommended for all systems or should these systems be required to be able to receive or transfer these elements? Art Pembroke said that all new systems and revisions to existing systems must conform to the list.

Development of Subcommittee Recommendations
Discussion began on what the recommendations from this subcommittee should be to the Advisory Group: adopt these elements for any new systems, and recommend that the Executive Committee take these standards forward to the legislature to make them mandatory? The group also agreed that the standards should be flexible in that revisions would be allowed without legislative action, and the Executive Committee and or Advisory Group needs the authority to do this. A motion for these recommendations was made by Jim Dougherty and seconded by Art; it was unanimously adopted.

Art asked what the Executive Committee's authority is now; Wilbur replied that the authority comes from a Memorandum of Understanding between the Governor, Chief Justice, and Attorney General. Questions came up about what kind of joint authority would be allowed under constitutional separation of powers. Lynne Pizzini said that state standards are typically set by policy, not legislatively. The State CIO has statutory authority to adopt IT standards, and similar language could be used for this situation.

The group also discussed adopting the JXDD as the transmission standard. Art suggested that the recommended legislation allow the Executive Committee to determine the standard. The group also decided that the JXDD should be recommended to the Executive Committee as the current recommended standard. Jim asked if the Supreme Court was considering the JXDD; Wilbur said that Dan Chelini was unable to make today's meeting but asked to be informed of the group's decisions, and that they are aware of the JXDD.

Clarification was asked about the recommendations and whether they meant that new or upgraded systems must include the data elements on the standardized list, and that the JXDD be the transmission standard. The group decided that the data should be required where applicable, with the understanding that there are a few elements on the list that may not be stored in all systems. The list represents data that is to be shared among systems. Discussion continued on what "where applicable" means.

Lynne asked about the notation on the last meeting's minutes about a security workgroup. She thinks the standards are done and is not sure what the workgroup would do.

Next Meeting
Wilbur said that he would work with Janet on the language of the recommendations and will send it out to the group for their review. Another meeting would be set up after this review.